

REMARKS

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 35-41, 43-49, and 61-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as not complying with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Statement regarding substance of interview

Applicant's representative appreciates the courtesies extended by Examiner Al-Hashemi during the telephone interview of May 1, 2009. During the interview, Examiner Al-Hashemi clarified the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In particular, Examiner Al-Hashemi indicated that the rejection is based on the addition of the following language in independent claim 35: "text that precedes the plurality of fields of the first tuple" and "text that follows the plurality of fields of the first tuple" and similar language in independent claims 45, 49, and 63.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 35-41, 43-49, and 61-65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly not complying with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In particular, the Examiner alleges that (final Office Action, p. 2):

[t]he newly amended limitation was not supported by the specification. Applicant is required to point out where in the specification the newly amended limitation is.

Applicant disagrees.

As set forth above, the Examiner clarified that the "newly amended limitation" refers to the following language in independent claim 35 - "text that precedes the plurality of fields of the first tuple" and "text that follows the plurality of fields of the first

tuple" - and the similar language added to independent claims 45, 49, and 63. Applicant submits that Applicant's specification, as originally filed, provides clear support for the above features.

Fig. 4 illustrates a process for extracting information from a database. As illustrated, the process includes searching for occurrences of at least one tuple (act 201), analyzing an occurrence of a tuple to identify a pattern (act 203), and extracting additional tuples utilizing the pattern (act 205). Additional details regarding these acts and examples of these acts are provided on pages 11-24 of Applicant's specification.

For example, with respect to patterns that can be identified, Applicant's specification sets forth, on pages 15 and 16, an exemplary pattern as a five-tuple of (*order, urlprefix, prefix, middle, suffix*). An (*author, title*) pair may, for example, match this five-tuple pattern if there is a document in the database with a URL that matches *urlprefix* and contains text that matches the regular expression *prefix, author, middle, title, suffix*, where *prefix* includes the *m* characters that precede the *author*, *middle* is text between the *author* and the *title*, and *suffix* includes the *m* characters following the *title*. Thus, Applicant submits that the *prefix* described above provides clear support for "text that precedes the plurality of fields of the first tuple" and the *suffix* described above provides clear support for "text that follows the plurality of fields of the first tuple."

In addition, original dependent claim 7 recites that "the pattern includes a prefix text and suffix text, where the prefix text precedes desired information in the tuples of information and the suffix text follows desired information in the tuples of information." Applicant submits that the prefix text recited in original claim 7 provides clear support for "text that precedes the plurality of fields of the first tuple" and the suffix text recited

in original claim 7 provides clear support for "text that follows the plurality of fields of the first tuple."

Finally, Applicant further directs the Examiner's attention to the flowchart depicted in Fig. 7, which is directed to identifying a pattern and includes setting the prefix and suffix in the exemplary 5-tuple pattern described above (see, for example, acts 509 and 511 in Fig. 7; and page 16, line 10 to page 17, line 2).

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 35 satisfies the written description requirement. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 36-41, 43, and 44 depend from claim 35. Therefore, Applicant submits that these claims satisfy the written description requirement for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 35. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 36-41, 43, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Independent claims 45, 49, and 63 recite features similar to (yet possibly of different scope than) the features described above with respect to claim 35. Therefore, Applicant submits that these claims satisfy the written description requirement for at least reasons similar to reasons given above with respect to claim 35. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 45, 49, and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 46-48 depend from claim 45, claims 61 and 62 depend from claim 49, and claims 64 and 65 depend from claim 63. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 46-48,

61, 62, 64, and 65 satisfy the written description requirement for at least the reasons given above with respect to claims 45, 49, and 63. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 46-48, 61, 62, 64, and 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejection are sufficient to overcome the above rejection, Applicant's silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such assertions is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP

By: /John E. Harrity, Reg. No. 43,367/
John E. Harrity
Registration No. 43,367

Date: May 18, 2009

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

Customer Number: 44989